

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-17 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-17 are rejected.

Claim 13 is objected to.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,831,409 to Yamada.

Claims 3-5, 10, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,831,409 to Yamada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,828,042 to Imanishi of record.

Claims 6-9, 11, 12, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,831,409 to Yamada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,828,042 to Imanishi of record and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,379 to Yokoyama of record.

Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

***Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

**Rejection of claim 1 under section 102(e) based on Yamada**

Fig. 6 of Yamada, which the Examiner refers to, does not disclose the “position” of the reflection/refraction angle disturbance region. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the member 14 of the Fig. 6 of Yamada corresponds to the reflection/refraction angle disturbance

region of the claimed invention (*see e.g.*, page 3, line 1 of the Office Action). However, Yamada does not disclose (or suggest) the position as recited in the amended claim 1.

Regarding the feature of the luminance value recited in claim 1, the Fig. 8 of Yamada merely discloses the intensity of the light emitted from an organic EL device after passing through the reflection/refraction angle disturbance region (i.e., member 14 of Yamada as mentioned by the Examiner). Therefore, the Fig. 8 of Yamada does not disclose the feature of the luminance value.

***Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

**Rejection of claims 3-5, 10, 14 and 16 under section 103(a) based on Yamada in view of Imanishi**

Claims 3-5, 10, 14 and 16 are dependent on claim 1, and therefore, are allowable at least for the above discussed reasons. Further, Imanishi does not overcome the objections noted above in the teachings of Yamada.

**Rejection of claims 6-9, 11, 12, 15 and 17 under section 103(a) based on Yamada in view of Imanishi and further in view of Yokoyama**

Claims 6-9, 11, 12, 15 and 17 are dependent on claim 1, and therefore, are allowable at least for the above discussed reasons. Further, Yokoyama does not overcome the objections noted above in the combined teachings of Yamada and Imanishi.

***General Comments***

Further, as shown in Tables 1-1, 1-2 and the Reference Examples 2-1, 2-2 of the Specification that the claimed invention has superior effects that are unexpected from the combined teachings of the cited references.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114  
U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/721,269

Attorney Docket No.: Q78680

*Allowable subject matter*

Claim 13 is indicated as being allowable but for its dependence on rejected base claims. We propose requesting the Examiner to hold the status of claim 13 in abeyance pending resolution of the status of the base claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 17, 2006